

Quality Counts Charter School Program (CSP Grant)
SCORING RUBRIC, Cohort 4, Revised October 2019

	Summary Peer Reviewer Score
CSP Applicant Name	Lawrence County Independent Schools

Peer Reviewer: This proposal is submitted to enable applicants to open a new school, expand, or replicate a high-quality public charter school. Select ONE by checking the box in the left-hand column.

<input type="checkbox"/>	Open	New school, opened within the past 3 years (Fall 2017), OR submitted a charter application to authorizer and will open within next 18 months
<input type="checkbox"/>	Replicate	Open a new charter school, or a new campus of a high-quality charter school, based on the educational model of an existing high-quality charter school under an additional charter
<input type="checkbox"/>	Expand	Significantly increase enrollment (20% or more enrollment growth); OR add one or more grade levels to a high-quality charter school beyond the original charter

OPTIONAL COMPETITIVE PREFERENCE PRIORITY (Up to 3 Points)			
0 points Applicant opts not to address this element, OR narrative does not focus upon any of the designated priority areas (Early Childhood, Postsecondary, or Rural)	1 point Area of focus is indicated, but only one of the three optional preference elements is fully described	2 points Area of focus is clearly defined, and two of the three optional preference elements are fully described	3 points Area of focus is clearly defined and <i>all three</i> elements fully addressed: (1) Expected targets and outcomes are clearly described; (2) Targets/outcomes are supported by qualitative or quantitative data or specific measurable and accessible goals; and (3) Unique populations are clearly defined and described
Reviewer Comments: Applicant has applied for the rural and post-secondary preference priority. A clear description is provided for the rural priority, however, the post-secondary priority is considered to be grades 9-12 and this is a K-8 school. The grant provided 5 targets- While the targets did address rural school concerns, there were no measurable outcomes identified. Additionally, supporting evidence had not been collected to generate data needed for this section of the grant. School is located in a rural community in which school closures have further limited students' access to high quality schools within a close commute. Although the school does not have a federal designation yet, local LEAs and schools in Springville are classified as Rural. The applicant does not qualify for the postsecondary preference point as it does not serve grades 9-12.			
Score			1

REQUIRED ELEMENTS

1. CHARTER SCHOOL VISION and EXPECTED OUTCOMES (Up to 6 Points)
--

Quality Counts Charter School Program (CSP Grant)
SCORING RUBRIC, Cohort 4, Revised October 2019

0 points No description provided or cited within Application ; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application	1-2 points Only 1-2 of the required six elements are <i>fully</i> described 1 point per element	3-5 points At least 3-5 of the required six elements are <i>fully</i> described. 1 point per element	6 points (1 point per element) <i>All six elements are fully developed and described. (1) Vision; (2) Need and Communication Plan; (3) Curriculum Framework and Key Evidence-based Instructional Practices; (4) Specific Strategies Support All Students in Meeting/Exceeding Indiana Academic Standards; (5) Development of 21st Century Skills or Preparing Students to be College & Career Ready; and (6) Sustainability beyond CSP Grant Funding</i>
<p>Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant describes the mission and vision of the school, but does not include information on the expected use of CSP funding. 1b) Applicant describes a plan for communicating with parents after the school is open, but does not review plans for informing and/or planning with the community prior to opening. 1c) Applicant provides a full description of curricular plan for science and engineering curriculum with project or inquiry based approach to instruction. Saxon math will be used. Reading instruction pedagogy is described with extensive discussion of pedagogy. Core Knowledge curriculum will be used and along with ongoing assessments for mastery of academic standards. Applicant will utilize Saxon math, but does not discuss curriculum ties to academic standards. 1d)Applicant addresses the approach to supporting students with IEPs and ELL students. 1e) Applicant discusses meeting the needs for 21st C skills. 1f) Applicant fully describes use and sustainability for CSP funds.</p> <p>A vision/mission was included. A needs assessment to support the claims was not embedded or attached. A general communication plan was noted- however specific details included methods, timelines, and stakeholders to be addressed was not included. Curricular foundations included Project Based Learning, Science Inquiry, and Engineering Design. Instructional models were outlined (AIPCI) in addition to specific curriculum and text aligned to the Indiana State Standards. Strategies included "SMARTS" and the Socratic Method. Specific strategies and instruction tied to 21st Cent. skills was not fully explored. The application did not expand upon how they would sustain after the grant was expended (where would dollars come from to continue the school for the future?)</p> <p>The vision of the school clearly articulates who the school intends to serve and the environment and outcomes it hopes to achieve for its students. The school was founded as a result of nearby school closures which left parents demanding a high quality school in their community. Parents were involved in the creation of the school, and the applicant has a plan for communicating with parents and the community during the startup process and after the school launches. Applicants have a plan for instructional strategies and a philosophical guide for their academic model, however it is not backed up by research and proven practices. Their math curriculum in particular is not standards aligned and the applicant does not provide the evidence-based rationale for selecting it. Applicant's plans to base lessons on state standards while incorporating lessons from other subjects and relevant topics to build students' core knowledge on specific subjects. This will allow teachers to scaffold lessons for students with disabilities and ELL students while keeping all students focused on the same concepts. The applicant has articulated a need for students to develop certain 21st century skills, but has not presented a plan for how they will be taught and incorporated into the model. CSP funds will be used to purchase furniture, supplies and equipment that are one-time startup costs and will not need to be replenished year over year. All staffing expenses will be funded by state and federal funding after the grant period ends.</p>			
Score	4		

2. EXPERTISE OF CHARTER SCHOOL DEVELOPERS (Up to 6 Points)			
0 points No description provided or cited within Application ; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application	1-2points Key personnel are identified, but descriptions are vague and qualifications not directly aligned to proposed program	3-4 points Key personnel are identified and solid descriptions provided showing each individual's qualifications aligned to the proposed program	5-6 points Key personnel are identified and their strong qualifications are clearly described and relevant to the proposed program. Team members appear to exhibit exceptional expertise and the previous successful experience needed to bring about academic growth and student achievement. Applicants that intend to REPLICATE or EXPAND must also provide data analyses findings to be scored within the 5-6 point range.
Reviewer Comments: <p>Applicant identifies the board members, many of whom have significant experience in business, management, and technology. School leader(s) are not mentioned and the applicant does not provide evidence that any of the board members have expertise in education. While several board members have served in Scouting and other community organizations (and there are parents on the board) there is a concern that at this point the applicant appears to lack expertise in educational leadership and persons with knowledge to bring about academic growth and student achievement.</p> <p>Key personnel are identified, all of which serving as professionals in their community. Through this portion of the application, no school leaders were identified and none of the key personnel have an education or charter background.</p> <p>While members of the board of directors have diverse backgrounds that can contribute to a successful organization, there is no one on the founding team that has K-8 education experience. Additionally, the school's founding administration team has not been identified, so it is unclear who will be leading the academic achievement initiatives.</p>			
Score			2

3. CHARTER SCHOOL GOALS & COMMUNICATION PLAN (Up to 9 Points Total)			
A. Charter School Goals (up to 7 points for this element, under Part A)			
0 points No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application	1-2 points Goal descriptions are partial, vague or unclear; <u>or</u> applicant has only identified one or two goals; <u>and/or</u> goals are not aligned to proposal priorities (e.g., STEM, Early Childhood, etc.)	3-5 points No less than three specific, measurable goals are identified. Some goals may not appear rigorous. Methods for measuring success toward goals described but may be somewhat unclear. Some key proposal priorities (e.g., STEM) do not have aligned goals.	6-7 points No less than three specific, measurable goals are clearly described. Academic outcomes of all students (all grade levels served) will be addressed. All goals appear rigorous, yet attainable. Applicant specifies who will do what, by when, and based upon what measurement. Applicant MUST include at least one goal aligned to a State Assessment to be scored within the 6-7 point range.
Reviewer Comments: <p>Goals are not written in the traditional way of stipulating the expectation, persons involved, measure for success and time-frame. However, they are broken into the elements of a SMART goal, so most of the information is provided. Goal two is vague in description of participants and measure of success. Goal three is somewhat vague as pertains to the specifics of STEAM furniture and materials. Goal five, relating to student learning, also lacks specificity, but includes numerous elements.</p> <p>The school only provided one measurable goal (#5) and it was vague in regards to execution. The other 4 identifiers were not goals, but activities to obtain "needs". Goals should be clearly stated and supported via a needs analysis.</p> <p>Goal #5 is the only one that focuses on direct student achievement and does satisfy the state assessment requirement. However, the other 4 goals are not rigorous and are not focused on students' achievement. Goals 2, 3 and 4 are simply purchases that can be done prior to the school opening, so they are not</p>			

Quality Counts Charter School Program (CSP Grant)
SCORING RUBRIC, Cohort 4, Revised October 2019

necessarily performance goals toward which the school can work. Goal 1 can indirectly support parent engagement and communication, but it is not rigorous and does not measure actual engagement.	
Score	2

Quality Counts Charter School Program (CSP Grant)
SCORING RUBRIC, Cohort 4, Revised October 2019

B. Communication Plan (up to 2 points for this element, under Part B)		
0 points Communication plan regarding goals not addressed	1 point A communication plan is outlined to describe school goals to some stakeholders (e.g., to staff and students but not to families)	2 points A communication plan that has been well thought out and includes multiple avenues to reach all stakeholders (staff, students, families) has been articulated with specificity
Reviewer Comments: Communication plan is thoughtful and contains multiple avenues to provide information to stakeholders. Limited and not specific. General in nature with very few details. Dates, timelines, and methods were not explicit nor expanded upon through the grant. Parents will receive communication at enrollment and throughout the year from the headmaster as well as teachers. The applicant will also communicate with the community via social media platforms and community meetings. Applicants will communicate goals to staff through staff meetings, phone calls and meetings. There is not a plan in place for communicating goals to students.		
Score		1

4. USE of CSP FUNDING (Up to 6 Points)			
A. Detailed Budget Narrative and Budget Worksheet Addressing all Expenditures Aligned to the Proposal (up to 4 points, for Part A)			
0 points No budget narrative, and detailed budget worksheets are not attached to proposal. <u>OR</u> , budget narrative is unclear and does not align to detailed budget attached and provides very limited or no detail to justify proposed expenditures. There are many discrepancies between the combined <i>Planning & Implementation</i> budget worksheet totals and the <i>Budget Summary</i> worksheet totals.	1 point Many budget narrative descriptors are partial, vague or unclear. Some costs have not been described within the proposal. Several discrepancies exist between the combined <i>Planning & Implementation</i> budget worksheet totals and the <i>Budget Summary</i> worksheet totals.	2-3 points Detailed budget narrative descriptors are provided for most line items and costs are aligned to initiatives described within the proposal. Most combined <i>Planning & Implementation</i> budget worksheet totals agree with the <i>Budget Summary</i> worksheet totals.	4 points Detailed budget narrative descriptors are provided for nearly all line items and are directly aligned to anticipated initiatives/costs described within the proposal narratives. The combined <i>Planning & Implementation</i> budget worksheet totals agree with the <i>Budget Summary</i> worksheet totals. Applicant MUST adhere to maximum of \$300K in planning year and a maximum of \$900K for total proposal budget to be scored within the 4 point range.

Reviewer Comments <p>Applicant provides detail and alignment to goals within the budget narrative. The narrative provides additional explanation on STEAM learning environment, materials needed and furniture purchases.</p> <p>There are many discrepancies between the combined Planning & Implementation budget worksheet totals and the Budget Summary worksheet totals. Total budget on spreadsheet for first year is \$296,649 and in narrative is \$296,3490. Year 1 budgets in spreadsheet and narrative do not align- \$375, 602 vs. \$590,270. Additionally the Property and Equipment narrative number and budget number do not align.</p> <p>Applicant has chosen expenses that are one-time startup costs and has clearly identified unit costs and quantities to match the enrollment and staffing projections. The Google chromebook and cart costs in the budget narrative (pre opening year) do not match the budget spreadsheet. Detailed descriptions are provided for each expense including how each expense aligns to school goals and outcomes for students.</p>	
Score	3
B. School's Capacity to Continue Implementation & Operation (up to 1 point, for Part B)	
0 Points <p>Explanation of how school will develop and maintain required capacity to continue the program after grant life is either not provided, inappropriate, or not adequately described</p>	1 Point <p>Explanation of how school will develop and maintain required capacity to continue the program after grant life is clearly articulated and sufficiently described</p>
Reviewer Comments: <p>Applicant provides sustainability plan. It is unclear and not specifically outlined on page 18 of the grant where indicated.</p> <p>Applicant has chosen expenses that are start-up costs and do not need to be replenished every year such as furniture, technology and supplies. The staffing costs and professional development will be incorporated into state and federal funding, and upkeep of technology will be paid for by the charter school grant.</p>	
Score	1
C. Costs are Reasonable, Allocable and Necessary (up to 1 point, for Part C)	
0 Points <p>Many costs appear either unreasonable, or unallowable, or unnecessary (as they cannot be directly tied to activities or personnel described within the applicant's proposal narratives)</p>	1 Point <p>All – or nearly all costs – appear reasonable, allocable and necessary</p>
Reviewer Comments: <p>Costs appear reasonable, allowable and necessary; tied to activities and personnel described within the applicant's narrative.</p> <p>All costs in the budget are directly aligned with the proposed school activities and are reasonably priced. The quantities suggested line up with the school enrollment and staffing plans, and are necessary to provide the services in this application. Staffing costs in the pre-opening year are needed for a successful school launch and the amounts are reasonable. The supplies and technology purchases will not increase the overall value of the property.</p>	
Score	1

Quality Counts Charter School Program (CSP Grant)
SCORING RUBRIC, Cohort 4, Revised October 2019

Points)
Six Required Elements (A-F each worth one point, for a total up to 6 Points)
A. All applicants provide description of governance structure of the school. If the school uses an EMO/CMO , applicant <i>also</i> must describe that partnership and why the EMO/CMO was selected
B. Description of how school operates (how charter school leaders are empowered to make daily decisions and how school staff work together)
C. Description of process to select board members and summarize member expectations
D. Description of governance training for board members, current and prospective

Quality Counts Charter School Program (CSP Grant)
SCORING RUBRIC, Cohort 4, Revised October 2019

E. Description of relationship between the charter school leadership, governing board, or authorizer with the EMO/CMO to ensure no apparent or real conflict of interest involved. IF the school does not use an EMO/CMO, scored as one point	
F. Description of how the charter school will ensure timely and accurate data submission for State and federal reporting requirements.	
Reviewer Comments: <p>Applicant provides an overview of the board responsibilities and relationship to the school leader. Applicant does not describe how board members will be selected every four years. It is not clear how board members are trained, other than a yearly meeting at Trine University. 5f) Applicant mentions a partnership with Indiana Charters, but does not mention specific reporting, such as APR, meeting CSP goals or other IDOE reporting. Explicit details are missing board training and school leader autonomy descriptions.</p> <p>Applicant has provided an overview of the board's role and responsibilities but has not addressed those of the Headmaster or other leadership staff. The Headmaster will be in charge of school culture, operations, student achievement and finances, and will interact with other staff via frequent meetings and committees. Clear board terms and a recruitment and selection process are presented. The board will receive training through its authorizer on topics such as legislative updates and best practices. Applicant is working with an outside provider to ensure timely reporting, and has identified the Headmaster as the staff member working alongside the vendor.</p>	
Score	4

6. STUDENT RECRUITMENT & ADMISSIONS PROCESSES (Up to 3 Points)			
0 points No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application	1 point Student recruitment plan description is partial, vague or unclear. Evidence to show compliance with IC 20-24-5 is not offered. Public lottery process is poorly described or not present.	2 points Student recruitment plan is described and evidence of compliance with IC 20-24-5 is offered but may not be complete. A public lottery process is adequately described.	3 points A multi-pronged student recruitment plan is clearly articulated and there is solid evidence of compliance with IC 20-24-5 presented. An appropriate public lottery process is clearly described.
Reviewer Comments: <p>Applicant stipulates that their recruitment plan informs the public that LCIS is tuition free. An appropriate public lottery process is detailed. The applicant states that students who qualify for free and reduced lunch may be given priority if stipulated in charter application, however, applicant does not clarify if this policy is or is not included in LCIS application. The school's recruitment process mentions, but does not detail a full, multi-pronged approach to informing the public.</p> <p>Applicant demonstrates an understanding of and adherence to IC 20-24-5 and has a recruitment plan that includes social media, direct mailers, paid advertising, and events. A public lottery process has also been established to allow for a randomized selection of students if applications exceed capacity, and a plan to backfill open spots is present.</p>			
Score:			2

7. NEEDS of EDUCATIONALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS (Up to 6 Points)

Quality Counts Charter School Program (CSP Grant)
SCORING RUBRIC, Cohort 4, Revised October 2019

0 points No description provided or cited within Application ; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application	1-2 points One or two student groups sufficiently addressed by applicant. <u>OR</u> more than two groups addressed but explanation of strategies does not seem appropriate or sufficiently adequate.	3-4 points Three or four student groups sufficiently addressed by applicant. <u>OR</u> more than three groups addressed but explanation of strategies does not seem appropriate or sufficiently adequate for all groups.	5-6 points <i>All five student groups are sufficiently addressed by the applicant (generating 5 points); <u>and</u> the applicant <i>descriptions are viewed as exemplary</i>, demonstrating the school's commitment to ensuring that special population needs are met (generating 6 points).</i>
Reviewer Comments: <p>Applicant has provided a plan for meeting the needs of students with disabilities that lacks some specificity with regard to the legal expectations required. (Additionally, several paragraphs are repeated). EL students are mentioned, but not discussed and other student groups are not mentioned in this response.</p> <p>The plan addresses students who have protection under Article 7, however does not explicitly address those students who are homeless, migrant, or considered ELL. Schools should use Indiana Code and Federal Law to ensure that strategies to support various subgroups are being met- EX: McKinney Vento.</p> <p>Applicant has addressed supports for students with disabilities such as IEPs, staffing support with aides, and an extended school day for additional support. However, specific supports for low income, ELL, homeless, and neglected and delinquent students were not provided.</p>			
Score			1

8. COMMUNITY OUTREACH ACTIVITIES (Up to 3 Points)			
0 points No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application	1 point Evidence of parent, teacher and community involvement in the planning and design of the charter school is partial, vague or unclear	2 points Evidence of parent, teacher and community involvement in the planning and design of the charter school is offered but does not seem fully explained	3 point Clear evidence of the involvement of parents, teachers, and community in the planning and design of the charter school is presented
<p>Applicant has begun the process of reaching out to the community through social media, newspaper articles and inviting some parents of students with IEPs to discuss their vision of the program. The applicant tends to speak more about community service to the school, than community or parental input into planning.</p> <p>While a few activities were noted- a strategic plan that outlined monthly events, opportunities, and stakeholders was not included. Some stakeholder groups are missing. There were no direct supports in how the community as a whole will support the development and creation of the school itself. Stakeholder input is lacking in this section.</p> <p>The school has gathered parent feedback through conversations with the board, public meetings and social media, and that input has helped to shape the approach to special education in particular. Community members have also been engaged to sign up for volunteer opportunities and commit resources, and they will have an active part in determining extracurricular offerings. Teacher engagement was not addressed.</p>			

Score Summary	2
----------------------	----------

9. FISCAL MANAGEMENT PLAN (Up to 6 Points)		
A. Internal Controls over Expenditure & Record Maintenance (up to 2 points, for Part A)		
0 Points No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application	1 Point Plan or process for maintaining internal controls over expenditures and record maintenance is generally described, but some pieces are partial, vague or unclear	2 Points A plan or process for maintaining internal controls over expenditures and record maintenance is clearly articulated
Reviewer Comments: Applicant provides a process for maintaining internal controls over finances that includes record maintenance and auditing processes. The proposed fiscal management plan mostly aligns to the state board of accounts, however, within the outline there was no separation of responsibility when it comes to the Business Manager and their role. This will be something the school will need to consider moving forward and for auditing purposes. Applicant has a plan in place to ensure financial transactions have multiple reviewers, including an external vendor. Indiana Charters will provide bookkeeping services, and the board will have oversight over large purchases and monthly reports. Applicant has a process for payroll, audits and annual budget development.		
Score Summary:		1
B. Charter School Leadership Responsible for Grant Management (up to 2 points, Part B)		
0 Points No description provided in narrative; or applicant only cites pages in Charter	1 Point Grant management process is described, but not fully-developed. Charter school leaders mentioned as responsible for grant, but EMO/CMO	2 Points Grant management process fully-described for decision-making, budget & tracking purchases. Charter school leaders are demonstrated to be responsible for all

Quality Counts Charter School Program (CSP Grant)
SCORING RUBRIC, Cohort 4, Revised October 2019

Application	explanation not fully-developed (if applicable)	aspects of grant, and not EMO/CMO (if applicable).
Reviewer Comments Grant management process is discussed broadly, but does not provide details on decision-making, creation of budget or tracking purchases. The school leader was not noted as having oversight of this grant. Grant management process will involve the business manager, headmaster, board and Indiana Charters. However, it is not clear who is ultimately responsible for the decision-making and ensuring all reporting guidelines are met.		
Score		1
C. Other State & Federal Funds Support School Operations (up to 2 points)		
0 Points No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application	1 Point Minimal/disjointed explanation for how State/federal funds will support school operations & student achievement	2 Points Solid descriptions for how other State and federal funds will support school operations and student achievement
Reviewer Comments: Applicant provides a broad overview statement regarding state and federal funds, but does not discuss specific information. Description did not include state and federal funds, grants, and expected revenue to support the school's plan. Coordinated funds were not noted. There were no details included and only a general summary of how school's are typically funded was provided. A budget sustainability worksheet was not included with the grant. State basic grant will support operations, staffing and supplies, while federal funds will support additional programming for special needs populations. However the explanations of how these funds will support student achievement are minimal.		
Score		1

10. FACILITIES and TRANSPORTATION				(Up to 3 Points)
0 points Applicant opts not to address these elements, OR narrative provided does not focus upon the facility or transportation plan	1point <i>One</i> of the three anticipated elements is provided, i.e., (a) safe, secure & sustainable facility; or (b) how enrollment impacts facility needs; or (c) transportation plan	2 points <i>Two</i> of the three anticipated elements are provided, i.e., (a) safe, secure & sustainable facility; and/or (b) how enrollment impacts facility needs; and/or (c) transportation plan	3 points All <i>three</i> elements are described: (a) how the facility is safe, secure and sustainable; (b) how enrollment impacts facility needs; <u>and</u> (c) a transportation plan that is aligned with the needs of the school	
Reviewer Comments: Applicant provides description of the school buildings to be attained for LCIS use. Both are ADA accessible and equipped with security cameras. The discussion of enrollment's impact on facility needs is adequate and the transportation plan is aligned with the needs of the school community. The school safety plan was not included- nor was a proposed safety plan. Applicant has confirmed that the available facilities can safely and sustainably accommodate their enrollment. Both facilities were previously operational schools and meet all the safety requirements, and				

Quality Counts Charter School Program (CSP Grant)
SCORING RUBRIC, Cohort 4, Revised October 2019

can accommodate the school at full enrollment. Applicant will purchase busses to provide transportation to students, and has accounted for the need for additional busses as enrollment increases.	
Score	2

11. SIGNED CHARTER SCHOOL ASSURANCES (Up to 3 Points)			
0 points None of the required signatures have been obtained and submitted with the proposal	1 point <i>One</i> of the three required signatures submitted, i.e., charter authorizer, or project contact person, or board president	2 points <i>Two</i> of the three required signatures submitted, i.e., charter authorizer, and/or project contact person, and/or board president	3 points <i>All</i> three required signatures submitted, i.e., charter authorizer, project contact person, <u>and</u> board president
Reviewer Comments: All signatures are submitted.			
Score:			2

12. REQUIRED APPENDICES (Up to 8 Points)	
Eight Required Appendix Elements (1 point for each element, items A-H below)	
A. Charter Application to Authorizer (for new or replication proposals) <i>or</i> Amendment to Existing Charter (for expansion proposal)	
B. Budget Worksheet	
C. Most recent <i>Expanded Annual Performance Report</i> (IDOE Compass) NOT APPLICABLE to new charter schools (scored as automatic point).	
D. Proof of Non-Profit Status of governing board, <u>or</u> proof that application for such status has been made	
E. Enrollment or Student Admissions Policy	
F. Agreement/contract between governing body and management organization. NOT APPLICABLE if applicant does not use an EMO or CMO (scored as automatic point).	
G. School's Discipline Policy (promotes retention/reduces overuse of practices that remove students from classroom)	
H. School's Safety Plan is attached in the appendix and evidence that it was submitted to the State Board of Education is present. NOT APPLICABLE to new charter schools opening the 2021 – 2022 school year (scored as an automatic point).	
Reviewer Comments: Applicant has submitted all applicable attachments.	
Score:	7

13. OVERALL ORGANIZATION of PROPOSAL (Up to 3 Points)			
0 points Information was not provided in anticipated sequence; and/or information was nearly always difficult to locate.	1 point Information requested was provided, but not consistently in the anticipated sequence. OR applicant exceeded 30-page narrative limit.	2 points Applicant followed requested sequence and stayed within page limitations. Generally, information was	3 points Applicant's proposal narrative clearly presented, following prescribed format, making the location of information and anticipated key elements readily available. Applicant did not exceed 30-page narrative

Quality Counts Charter School Program (CSP Grant)
SCORING RUBRIC, Cohort 4, Revised October 2019

		easily located.	limit.
Reviewer Comments: Applicant followed requested sequence and stayed within page limitations. Charter application and attached documents made it difficult to find key elements of the application. Applicant is within the 30 page limit, each section is clearly defined and key elements are available.			
Score:			2

SUMMARY OF PEER REVIEWER SCORES

Name of Applicant: _____ **Summary Score** _____

Scored Elements	Points Possible	Points Awarded
*Optional Competitive Preference Priority (Early Childhood, Postsecondary, Rural)	3	1
1. Charter School Vision & Expected Outcomes	6	4
2. Expertise of the Charter School Developers	6	2
3. (A) Charter School Goals	7	2
(B) Goals Communication Plan	2	1
4. Use of CSP Funds (A) Detailed Budget Addressing All Expenditures Aligned to Proposal.....	4	3
(B) School's Capacity to Continue Implementation & Operation.....	1	1
(C) Costs are Reasonable, Allocable & Necessary.....	1	1
5. School Governance Plan & Administrative Relationships	6	4
6. Student Recruitment & Admissions Processes	3	2
7. Needs of Educationally Disadvantaged Students	6	1
8. Community Outreach Activities	3	2
9. Fiscal Management Plan (A) Internal Controls over Expenditures & Record Maintenance	2	1
(B) Charter School Leadership Responsible for Grant Management	2	1
(C) Other State & Federal Funds Support School Operations	2	1
10. Facilities & Transportation	3	2
11. Signed Charter School Assurances	3	2
12. Required Appendices	8	7
13. Overall Organization of Proposal	3	2
TOTAL POINTS	68	40/68